



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/738,357 | 12/15/2003 | Dan Jones | 45098.00017-ORD-U1 | 8550 |
| 67670 | 7590 | 08/17/2011 | EXAMINER | |
| TOM TILDEN | | | KE, PENG | |
| 11808 Miracle Hills Drive | | | ART UNIT | |
| MSW11-Legal | | | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Omaha, NE 68154 | | | 2174 | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/17/2011 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

TNTILDEN@WEST.COM

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/738,357 | Applicant(s) JONES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner SIMON KE | Art Unit 2174 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 08/10/2010. Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, and 22 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 08/10/2010, Claims 1, 11, 17, 22, and 24 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

It is unclear what the applicant is claiming.

With regard to independent claim 1, applicant's claim recites: "the toolbar region includes the entire local user display region besides the task bar region...and the desktop region within the local user display region;" the two statements are contradictory.

The examiner interpreted the limitation to be the toolbar region includes part of user display beside taskbar region.

With regard to independent claim 17, applicant's claim recites: "a desktop region, wherein the taskbar region represents an area of which is outside a desktop region...and a toolbar region, wherein the toolbar region includes the entire display besides the task bar region;" the two statement are contradictory.

Art Unit: 2174

The examiner interpreted the limitation to be the toolbar region includes part of the display besides the task bar.

With regard to independent claim 22, the claim recites "the sharer toolbar region includes the entire desktop region excluding the taskbar region;" but there are a sharer desktop region and a desktop. It is unclear which desktop the limitation is referring to.

The examiner interpreted the limitation to a sharer desktop region and a desktop region to be the same region.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin US Patent 5,790,818 in view of Hansen US Patent 5,659,693 further in view of Ettinger US Publication 2004/0103151.

As per claim 1, Martin teaches a user interface on a display device for application sharing in a multimedia collaboration system, wherein the user interface, comprises:

- a local user display region; (see Martin; fig. 4, col. 4, lines 55-col. 5, lines 30)
- a taskbar region within the local user display region; (see Martin; fig. 4, col. 4, lines 55-col. 5, lines 30)
- a remote user display region; (see Martin; fig. 5, item 412) and
- one or more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region, used to control the display region; (see Martin; fig. 5, item 422)

Art Unit: 2174

the local user display region on tasks related to session control and document previews that are not visible or accessible to a remote user; (see Martin; fig. 4, col. 4, lines 55-col. 5, lines 30)

wherein the remote user is able to view contents of a remaining portion of the local user display region.(see Martin; fig.4, col. 4, lines 55-col. 5, lines 30)

However, Martin fails to teach wherein a local user is able to resize the taskbar region to efficiently use the taskbar region and

Hansen teaches resizing of the taskbar region to efficiently use the taskbar region. (see Hansen col.5, lines 1-40)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Hansen's teaching with method of Martin in order to provide user with the ability to adjust usable space.

However, they fail to teach a desktop region;

the desktop region within the local user display region;

a toolbar region, wherein the toolbar region includes the entire local user display region besides the taskbar region;

wherein the remote user is able to view contents of a remaining portion of the local user display region.

Ettinger teaches a desktop region; (see Ettinger; paragraphs 0004; 0032; and 0090-0092)

the desktop region within the local user display region;(see Ettinger; paragraphs 0004; 0032; and 0090-0092)

a toolbar region, wherein the toolbar region includes the local user display region besides the taskbar region; (see Ettinger; paragraphs 0004; 0032; and 0090-0092)

Art Unit: 2174

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ettinger's teaching with method of Martin in order to share a user's desktop with other users.

As per claim 2, Martin, Hansen, and Ettinger teach the user interface of claim 1, Hansen wherein the taskbar region can be resized within the display region. (see Hansen; paragraph col. 5, lines 1-40)

As per claim 4, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region can be minimized. (see Hansen, col. 3, lines 25-45; item 29)

As per claim 5, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region can be relocated within the display region. (see Hansen, col. 3, lines 25-45;)

As per claim 6, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, wherein the desktop region can be resized within the local user display region. (see, Hansen col. 3, lines 63-col. 4, lines 8)

As per claim 7, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, wherein each control area in the task region includes a menu of control options. (see, Hansen, col. 3, lines 25-45)

As per claim 8, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, wherein a configuration associated with the taskbar region can be changed, (see Hansen, col. 3, lines 25-45; item 29)and wherein a configuration associated with the desktop region (see Hansen col. 5, lines 5-30) is automatically changed in response to a change in the configuration of the taskbar region. (see Hansen, col. 5, lines 1-20)

As per claim 9, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 8, wherein the change in the configuration associated with the taskbar region includes a change of the position or a change of the size of the taskbar region. (see Hansen, col. 5, lines 1-20)

As per claim 10, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 8, wherein the change in the configuration associated with the local user display region includes a

Art Unit: 2174

change of the position or a change of the size of the local user display region. (see Hansen, col. 5, lines 1-20)

As per claim 11, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 2, wherein resizing the taskbar region automatically resizes the desktop region to maximize and efficiently use the visible area of the desk-top region within the display region without creating any overlap between the taskbar region and the desktop region. (see Hansen, col. 5, lines 1-20)

As per claim 12, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, wherein each application window can be resized within the desktop region. (see Eittinger, fig. 15, item 1540; fig. 13 item 1320)

As per claim 14, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, wherein the taskbar region includes multiple control applications controllable by the local user via a menu of control options within the control areas. (see Eittinger, paragraphs 0096-0097)

As per claim 16, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1, further comprising a plurality of taskbar regions.

As per claim 17, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Supra.

As per claim 18, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the multimedia collaboration system of claim 17, wherein the local multimedia device further comprises a sharer collaborative application that can be activated through a sharer control option provided in the sharer control area of the sharer taskbar region. (see Eittinger, paragraphs 0096-0097)

As per claim 19, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the multimedia collaboration system of claim 18, wherein the sharer collaborative application is configured to allow at least a portion of the sharer desktop region to be shared with the remote multimedia device, while preventing sharing of the sharer task bar region. (see Martin, fig. 5, col. 5, lines 55-70)

As per claim 20, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the multimedia collaboration system of claim 19, the portion of the sharer desktop region that is being shared with the remote multimedia device. (see Martin, fig. 5, col. 5, lines 55-70)

As per claim 22, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11. Supra.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 23, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the method of claim 22, wherein sharing at least a portion of the sharer desktop region comprises sharing with the remote multimedia device a window associated with an application running at the local multimedia device. (see Eittinger, paragraph 0096-0097)

As per claim 24, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the method of claim 22, further comprising changing a configuration associated with the sharer taskbar region and automatically changing a configuration, associated with the sharer desktop region in response to the change to the configuration associated with the sharer taskbar region so that the sharer desktop region is resized to efficiently use the sharer desktop region without obscuring any portion of the sharer taskbar region. (see Martin, col. 5, lines 15-30)

As per claim 25, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim of claim 1, wherein the display region is configured so that there is no overlap between any portion of the taskbar region and any portion of the desktop region. (see Hansen, col. 5, lines 5-40)

As per claim 26, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the multimedia collaboration system of claim 17, wherein the local multimedia device is configured so that there is no overlap between any portion of the sharer taskbar region and any portion of the sharer desktop region. (see Hansen, col. 5, lines 5-40)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin US Patent 5,790,818 in view of Hansen US Patent 5,659,693 further in view of Ettinger US Publication 2004/0103151 in view Straub US Patent 6,216,141.

As per claim 3, Martin, Hansen, and Eittinger teach the user interface of claim 1. However, they fail to teach wherein the taskbar region can be closed.

Straub teach the application region can be closed. (see Straub col. 7, lines 55-col. 8, lines 15)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straub's teaching with method Martin in order to provide user the flexibility to use the desktop space.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2174

Peng Ke

/Peng Ke/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174